COMMANDERS DIGEST

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE • WASHINGTON, D.C.

PROPERTY OF PRINCETON UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

AUG 5 1968

Vol. 4, No. 42 July 20, 1968

MACKAY TROPHY WINNERS—Gen. John P. McConnell, Air Force Chief of Staff, presents the Mackay Trophy, awarded annually within the Air Force for the "most meritorious flight of the year," to a Strategic Air Command KC-135 crew for an air refueling mission during which they saved six Navy carrier-based aircraft and their crews. Receiving the trophy are (l to r) MSgt. Nathan C. Campbell, Maj. John H. Casteel and Capts. Richard L. Trail and Dean L. Hoar.

President Johnson Lauds Signing Of Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty

President Johnson has referred to the recently-signed Treaty on Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons as "the most important international agreement limiting arms since the nuclear age began."

He also said "it is a triumph of sanity and of man's will to survival."

The Treaty was signed July 1, 1968 in Washington, D. C., London and Moscow. Ninety-five members of the United Nations had voted to commend it and to request that it be opened for signature and ratification at the earliest possible date.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee currently is holding hearings on the measure. Once reported out of committee it will go to the Senate floor for consideration.

Among the top Defense Department officials testifying before the committee were Paul H. Nitze, Deputy Secretary of Defense, and Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. Nitze said the international agreement to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons will not hinder the further development of nuclear defense arrangements within the NATO Alliance.

Referring to the Security Assur-

(Continued on Page 3)

Clifford Makes First RVN Trip As Defense Sec.

During his first visit to Vietnam since taking office, Secretary of Defense Clark M. Clifford received reports on almost every aspect of the war effort from top American and Vietnamese officials.

He was also scheduled to participate in conferences in Honolulu about July 20 when President Johnson and South Vietnamese President Thieu meet there.

Mr. Clifford said in Saigon "we are interested in doing all that we can to develop the ARVN" and the manner in which they are to be used more fully in the days that lie ahead.

He said production of the M-16 rifle had been accelerated. "We had but one producer before, and we now have contracted to open two more sources of supply. We will be turning M-16s out at a substantially more rapid rate as we get into the end of the year."

He said preference would be given to the ARVN forces—all ARVN forces —"even at the expense of our own forces to give all of the ARVN forces the M-16 just as soon as we can."

Before his departure for Southeast Asia, Mr. Clifford told Pentagon newsmen that he believed "we must face reality that our intelligence discloses that there is a great deal of enemy activity in I Corps. Where before at one time they had four divisions and then six, it now appears that they are up to eight divisions there and possibly some more."

There is also increased enemy activity in the 3rd Corps around Saigon, he said. "So, I believe we must anticipate the possibility of a new offensive on the part of enemy forces in

(Continued on Page 7)

DOD Offers Substitute Proposal on Pueblo Special Pay Bill

The Department of Defense has proposed substitute legislation for the $65 special monthly pay to include members of the crew of the USS Pueblo, who were captured by the North Koreans, Jan. 23, 1968, and other personnel that may be involved under similar situations.

Appearing before House of Representatives Subcommittee Number 2 of the Committee on Armed Services, Maj. Gen. William W. Berg, USAF, said the Department of Defense supports the purposes of H.R. 17780 which propose special pay for the Pueblo crew; however, "the current and foreseeable international situation dictates legislation of more general applicability."

Existing law does not permit payment of the $65 special pay to members of the Pueblo.

The Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Military Personnel Policy explained that the Secretary of Defense is authorized to prescribe regulations under which the special pay will be made.

Gen. Berg said a member who is killed, injured or wounded by hostile fire any place in the world is entitled to payment under the regulations.

He added, "The Secretary of Defense in 1965 designated all of Vietnam and the contiguous waters as a hostile fire area, extending the entitlement to all personnel stationed in-country.

"More recently, on April 1, 1968, a small enclave along the western end of the DMZ in Korea was also designated as a hostile fire area for purposes of this entitlement."

The general went on to explain, "When a member who is entitled to hostile fire pay becomes missing or captured, the provisions of the Missing Persons Act provide for him to continue to receive such pay until he returns to military control or a legal finding of death is made and his estate is settled.

"Unfortunately, members of the Armed Forces who may be missing or captured under circumstances such as the USS Pueblo may not be awarded this special pay.

"On March 5, 1965 the Comptroller General of the United States, in his Ruling B-156088, rendered the opinion that the legislative history clearly established the intent not to authorize the payment of this special pay for duty subject to hostile fire to members of a uniformed service captured or missing as the result of hostile action if they had not otherwise qualified for such pay immediately prior to that time."

He pointed out that the proposed legislation is designed to offset the unfortunate consequences of this ruling which now serves to deny the special pay to crew members of the USS Pueblo now in the hands of the North Koreans.

DOD's substitute proposal would amend Section 310 of title 37, U.S. Code, by adding the clause, "Was in a captured or missing status under circumstances that indicate action by a hostile force was involved." It also proposed that effective date of the legislation be set as Jan. 1, 1968.

Gen. Berg said the Department of Defense has long held the view that any member of the uniformed services who is captured by a hostile force, or is missing under circumstances that indicate hostile action was involved, should be entitled to hostile fire pay.

PROMOTED—Gen. Creighton W. Abrams (right), Commander, U.S. Military Assistance Command Vietnam, congratulates Lt. Gen. W. R. Peers, CG, I Field Force Vietnam, upon his promotion to three-star rank June 27. Brig. Gen. George S. Blanchard, I FFORCEV chief of staff, looks on.

COMMANDERS DIGEST

THIS PUBLICATION CONTAINS OFFICIAL INFORMATION, NEWS AND POLICY, DIRECT FROM WASHINGTON AUTHORIZED SOURCES.

Published weekly by Armed Forces Press Service, 1117 N. 19th St., Arlington, Va. 22209, a unified activity of the Office of Information for the Armed Forces, OASD (M&RA). Reproduction of content is authorized. Suggested dateline for materials used is WASHINGTON (AFPS).

Massad Receives Oath As First Deputy ASD For Reserve Affairs

Ernest L. Massad was sworn in July 15 as the first Deputy Assistant Secretary (M&RA) for Reserve Affairs.

Mr. Massad was administered the oath of office by Solis Horwitz, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Administration.

President Johnson nominated Mr. Massad for the position on May 22. The senate confirmed the nomination June 6.

As Deputy for Reserve Affairs, Mr. Massad will be responsible for all matters relating to reserve affairs within the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Reserve Affairs.

The Office of Reserve Affairs serves as the focal point for coordinating all matters pertaining to the Reserve components of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps.

REPORTING FOR DUTY—VAdm. Luther C. Heinz (right) salutes as he reports to Adm. Ephraim P. Holmes, Commander in Chief, U.S. Atlantic Fleet for duty. Adm. Heinz relieved VAdm. Lloyd M. Mustin as Commander Amphibious Force, U.S. Atlantic Fleet, July 11. Change of command took place aboard the amphibious transport dock USS Raleigh at the Little Creek Naval Amphibious base, Norfolk, Va.

Non-Proliferation Treaty

(Continued from Page 1)

ances Resolution adopted by the United Nations Security Council in connection with the UN debate on the Treaty, Mr. Nitze said:

"The Defense Department worked closely with the State Department and the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency in working out the provisions of the Resolution and the Statement. We believe that the adoption of this Resolution, sponsored by the U.S., the UK and the USSR, adds significantly to the security of those non-nuclear-weapon States adhering to the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

"It does so, not by increasing security commitments, but by giving evidence to all nations that both the U.S. and the Soviet Union share the utmost concern in preventing any act or threat of aggression with nuclear weapons.

"I wish the Committee to clearly understand," Mr. Nitze continued, "that the Department of Defense is under no illusion that we need no longer worry about the proliferation of nuclear weapons. We recognize that the consummation of this treaty will not, of itself, guarantee against any possibility of another nation acquiring nuclear weapons. I do believe, however, that this treaty is the best that can be negotiated in the present world order, that it will gain wide adherence, and that the security of all nations will be increased proportionately with the signature and ratification of each new party."

In his testimony before the committee Gen. Wheeler said "the Joint Chiefs of Staff have long been on record as supporting balanced, phased, safeguarded, and verifiable arms control measures.

"However, empirical evidence from man's historical attempts at arms control leads us to view such measures with circumspection. Consequently, at the initiation of Treaty discussions, the Joint Chiefs of Staff formulated certain principles relating to national security that should not be violated by such a Treaty.

"First, we believe that any international agreement on the control of nuclear weapons must not operate to the disadvantage of the United States and our Allies. Secondly, it must not disrupt any existing defense alliances in which the United States is pledged to assist in protecting the political independence and territorial integrity of other nations. These principles have been observed."

General Wheeler added: "the Joint Chiefs of Staff consider that any arms control agreement must contain provisions for effective safeguards and reliable verification procedures. Article III of the Treaty provides for the establishment of these safeguards under the monitorship of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

"In summary, the Joint Chiefs of Staff are in agreement with the expressed objectives of this Treaty and support ratification of the Treaty as not inimical to United States security interests."

Foreign Trade and Our National Interests

U.S. foreign trade policy is of vital interest to us and to the rest of the world, since it affects the growth of both our own and the world's economy. Secretary of State Dean Rusk recently discussed our trade policy in an appearance before the House Ways and Means Committee. Below are excerpts from his statement.

There are few matters of greater interest, both immediate and long-term, to the people of this country than trade policy.

International trade affects in a very concrete way the economic well-being of almost everyone. It affects the livelihoods of people who have nothing to do with international trade almost as much as it does those who are directly engaged in production for export or in handling imports. It affects the peasant in the Andes, the entrepreneur in Dusseldorf, the production line worker in Milwaukee or Detroit or Osaka, and the farmer in Kansas or Manitoba.

Trade means sales and increased production—and these mean jobs, profits, and investments.

When exports rise, demand rises for all the elements that go into export: for raw materials, components, end products, transportation, and labor. The increased income generated by increased exports stimulates demand for purely domestic goods and services, as well as for imports. In short, trade means buoyancy, economic growth, and rising standards of living. When export opportunities and earnings are reduced, domestic production, employment, and growth rates are all depressed. With expanding trade they all are boosted.

Trade and Foreign Policy

The trade policy the United States chooses to follow is singularly important to ourselves and to the world.

Our position as the largest single trading nation underlines our special responsibility to insure that our trade policy promotes a continued growth of our own and the world economy. Fortunately, in this area, actions which best advance the welfare of our own people are precisely those which best serve our foreign policy objectives.

Those objectives can be stated quite simply: we seek a world at peace, secure against aggression, so that each nation may pursue its destiny under whatever form of government its people choose—an international framework of political tolerance which will permit the energies and ingenuity of man to turn from war to peaceful and more rewarding pursuits.

The trade policy the United States has pursued for more than three decades contributes to these broad political objectives. The United States has been the principal proponent and initiator of action to reduce unnecessary restrictions on the movement of goods and services across national boundaries.

Advantages of a Liberal Policy

Theory, doctrine and slogans had little to do with the decision this country made to promote the cause of liberal trade. That decision was based on a hard-headed assessment of our own national interest plus a sensible recognition that the policies which had failed so miserably in the earlier decades of this century certainly ought not to be repeated.

A liberal trade policy is not a giveaway program. We gain and our trading partners gain. Both parties gain because:

—consumers have wider choices of goods

—spurred by competition and enterprises producing for a world market, with lower unit costs and economies of scale, prices are lower than they otherwise would be;

—there are more jobs here and abroad;

—and incomes are higher than would otherwise be the case.

On top of these tangible, observable, measurable gains for our own people and our friends abroad, there are the indirect gains of progress toward the basic foreign policy goals I mentioned a moment ago.

Miracle in Western Europe

In Western Europe, the economic miracle of recovery from World War II in less than a decade and the unprecedented levels of prosperity which have followed, would not have occurred—at least not so rapidly—had it not been for two decisions: first, the decision, at our

urging, to break down intra-European barriers; and then the agreement to join with us in successive multilateral, reciprocal reductions of trade barriers.

Western Europe still has its problems, and we still have problems there. However, our long-standing policy of helping Western Europe to gain in strength has produced some reciprocal benefits to us: greater strength in mutual security arrangements, help in meeting the development needs in Africa, Asia, and Latin America, and help in meeting our own pressing balance of payments difficulties.

A Major Problem: Developing Countries

Trade policies toward developing countries are already becoming a major problem. The ever-growing disparity between rich nations and poor nations is a fact which neither we nor our affluent friends in other industrialized countries have yet fully faced up to.

Poverty and resentment are the breeding grounds for hostility in international relations, no less than in our domestic society.

One thing is clear: additional trade restrictions by the United States affecting more than one hundred countries of the developing world would not help them to overcome their problems of poverty, but would, instead, breed resentment and store up additional problems both for today and for the years ahead.

Our trade policy toward the countries of Eastern Europe has failed to keep up with the needs of the times. We are presently deprived of the flexibility to respond to rapidly-changing circumstances. We are not now in a position to pursue our own economic self-interest.

Protectionism vs. a Liberal Policy

Two broad choices are currently before the Committee and the American people: a retreat to protectionism on a grand scale, or further—albeit modest—efforts to continue along the path of reducing unnecessary trade barriers while preserving the gains of more than thirty years' work.

We simply cannot get away with major trade restrictions without paying for them by an equivalent reduction of the export opportunities of other sectors of our economy. We cannot get away with it because under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) our trading partners are free to retaliate against us if we nullify the value of concessions we have negotiated with them.

World trade would shrink to insignificant levels if each country were free to go back on its word with impunity. This, too, is not theoretical. We know what happened in the 1930s when each country tried to export unemployment by insulating itself from the world economy behind high tariffs.

The costs would not be confined to the economic costs of a smaller volume of trade with all the attendant costs of fewer jobs, lower profits, higher prices, reduced standards of living and lower rates of economic growth—formidable as they are. There would be incalculable costs to our foreign relations as well.

We would place in jeopardy the cooperative relations with Western Europe we have built up over so many years. The partnership we have nurtured with Japan would be put to a very severe test—and it might not survive if we were to adopt wholesale restrictions which would have a serious impact on Japan's ability to make its way in the world.

Trade restrictions of the scope Congress has been asked to adopt would violate commitments we have made to our Latin America partners in the Alliance for Progress as well as other developing countries. All of these would despair to see doors closed to them just as—or even before—some of them are reaching a point of economic development where they can hope to reduce their reliance on external assistance and pay more of their own way through trade.

This all adds up to a very heavy price for protection. The price would be inestimably greater for our economy and nation as a whole than the short-term gains a few industries might hope to reap by quitting the competitive race and letting someone else—that is the rest of us—pay the bill.

Proposed Trade Act of 1968

There is an alternative: the Administration's trade bill—the proposed Trade Expansion Act of 1968. This alternative will consolidate the trade gains successfully negotiated in the Kennedy Round. It will give the Administration the flexibility it needs for tariff action of the housekeeping type to prevent an unravelling of the Kennedy Round concessions.

Congressional approval of the other key elements in the Administration's bill will assure to this nation the continuing economic growth which exports provide. It will also signify to the world America's determination to continue on the proven path of an expanding international economy and rejection of a reversal of America's leadership in the reduction of trade barriers.

Research Budget for SEA Support Seen on Rise

Defense research money budgeted for projects to support the war in Southeast Asia may rise $225 million by the end of this fiscal year to a total of $800 million.

That was the estimate of Dr. John S. Foster Jr., Director of Defense Research and Engineering, in a statement July 10 before the Senate subcommittee on Department of Defense appropriations.

Reporting to the committee on the FY 69 Defense research, development, test and evaluation program, Dr. Foster said, "Though this R&D investment is certainly large, it is paying off."

He said significant new capabilities have strengthened and will continue to strengthen the capability of general purpose forces to wage limited wars and to deter such wars in the future.

Dr. John S. Foster Jr.

Counter-Infiltration

In the context of the four major efforts in Southeast Asia, Dr. Foster said emphasis will be placed on these programs:

"We have two major problems—detecting infiltrating personnel and vehicles along the many roads, trails, rivers and streams deep under jungle canopy, and effectively attacking these targets around the clock, in all weather conditions. We need:

—Vigorous work on sensor technology to allow troops to find the enemy and determine his pattern of operation in jungle and other difficult terrain.

—Improvements in our ordnance delivery capability so that targets can be hit accurately and decisively.

—Development of counter-infiltration techniques and border security systems which can be effective in both peacetime or limited war environments.

Neutralization of Main Force-Type Units

The VC/NVA main force poses a constant threat to the security of the country side, and give both physical and psychological support to the local guerrilla units.

Again, we need vast improvements for this mission in target acquisition, including new sensor technology, and accurate and discriminating weapons.

(We need) imaginative engineering support to reduce time and manpower requirements for construction of small camps and military bases, jungle clearing, and construction of defensive positions in hostile environments.

Interdiction Operations

Technically, our main problems in this mission are: target acquisition, and the accuracy and lethality of our weapons. There are also problems in getting to the target—including penetration of AAA, SAM and aircraft defense—and in aircraft survivability. The most promising countermeasures are improvements in achieving greater survivability for our aircraft.

Search and rescue efforts must be improved.

We are also studying and experimenting with more advanced rescue concepts such as mid-air snatch of pilots who have ejected. High priority work is also underway on better equipment for locating and communicating with downed aircrewmen.

Pacification

Studies involve the following: design of village and hamlet security system; communications systems improvements to give the lowest echelon of government more reliable means of obtaining assistance when attacked and design of route security systems to keep RVN lines of communication open. These programs capitalize on the use of appropriate intrusion detection. They also give attention to the improvement of the Regional and Popular Forces largely responsible for local security.

Research efforts to develop information necessary for planning sound programs to encourage VC defection and to increase local support for the GVN have been started and will continue in FY 1969.

We are presently establishing a stronger central R&D organization within the MACV scientific advisor's staff. Among other efforts, this group will coordinate and carry out much of the pacification research being conducted in South Vietnam . . ."

One of the Lessons

Dr. Foster said one of the lessons learned from waging war in an insurgency environment is that a "conventional military effort, while important, is not likely to be the fundamental ingredient of a long term settlement of problems in Southeast Asia."

He said the R&D demands of the pacification program are now "understood more clearly and recognized as central."

While saying he was alert to the special features of the conflict in Southeast Asia, Dr. Foster added that "we are convinced that only a very few of our R&D activities should be reduced substantially when the war in Vietnam ends."

"Our long-term defense posture depends strongly and critically upon imaginative thinking about these problems," he said.

President Names 58 Army Colonels For One-Star Rank

President Johnson has nominated 58 Army colonels to the Senate for confirmation for promotion to the grade of temporary brigadier general. The announcement said promotions will be made as vacancies occur subsequent to Senate confirmation.

Nominated were:

Harold G. Moore Jr., INF; George W. Casey, INF; Judson F. Miller, ARMOR; C. J. LeVan, ARTY; William W. Watkin, CE; Robert C. McAlister, ARTY; Alexander R. Bolling, INF; Frederic E. Davison, INF; William L. Starnes, CE; Marlin W. Camp, ARTY; John H. Cushman, INF.

DeWitt C. Armstrong III, ARMOR; Fred E. Karhohs, INF; Richard C. Horne III, SIGC; Samuel L. Reid, ARTY; Robert C. Marshall, CE; James W. Gunn, TC; James J. Ursano, AGC; Donald V. Rattan, INF; John H. Elder Jr., CE; John C. Bennett, INF; George W. Putnam Jr., ARTY; Emmett R. Reynolds, SIGC.

George M. Bush, CE; Dennis P. McAuliffe, ARTY; Sidney M. Marks, INF; George C. Cantlay, ARMOR; Arthur H. Sweeney, ORDC; George M. Snead Jr., SIGC; James C. Smith, ARMOR; William R. Bond, INF; Bertram K. Gorwitz, ARTY; John K. Singlaub, INF; John W. Morris, CE; Harold A. Kissinger, SIGC.

Claude M. McQuarrie Jr., INF; Joseph E. Pieklik, QMC; Henry J. Schroeder Jr., ARTY; Thomas F. McCord, MI; Edward M. Dooley, ORDC; Hubert S. Cunningham, INF; Wallace C. Magathan, ARTY; Jack MacFarlane, ARMOR; Maurice W. Kendall, INF; Harold R. Parfitt, CE; Richard H. Groves, CE.

Richard H. Johnson, INF; Stewart C. Meyer, ARTY; Edwin B. Owen, TC; Michael E. Leeper, QMC; David E. Ott, ARTY; Clarke T. Baldwin Jr., ARMOR; Jack A. Albright, SIGC; Hugh R. Higgins, QMC; Charles M. Young Jr., ARTY; Bert A. David, INF.; Sam S. Walker, INF, and William B. Caldwell III, INF.

SecDef Visits Vietnam

(Continued from Page 1)

July or possibly in August, and General Wheeler and I will wish to talk this out in great detail with General Abrams and his chief commanders in the field."

Answering a question on the bombing halt north of the 20th Parallel, Mr. Clifford said "we have concentrated our efforts at this particular time on the interdiction of the roads in the panhandle, south of the 20th.

"I believe our efforts have been very effective there. In some respect possibly the concentration of our efforts on a more limited target has in some respects produced more dividends and rewards than if the bombing were spread over a larger area. So, I think that the bombing south of the 20th has been effective and has continued to this day to be quite an effective operation."

On the subject of American troop withdrawal from Vietnam, Mr. Clifford said "I have not predicted personally that we would withdraw American troops in 1969. I have said in the past that I hope that the ARVN will develop to the point where we can begin to move them into the line in greater numbers, begin to move our troops back in reserve, and then ultimately at some time in the future withdraw our troops.

"I have not given any indication as to that date. Insofar as the present is concerned, we believe here, and I think that belief is also joined in by our commanders in the field that the number of American troops we have at present in Vietnam are adequate and sufficient to repel any offensive that the enemy might choose to level."

DEPUTY SURGEON GENERAL — Brig. Gen. Glenn J. Collins, Chief Surgeon of Vietnam, has been named Deputy Surgeon General, U. S. Army. He will assume the new post in September. Gen. Collins has been the Surgeon, U. S. Army, Vietnam, since July, 1967, and before that was Commandant of the Medical Field Service School, Fort Sam Houston, Tex. He succeeds Maj. Gen. James T. McGibony, who has been named Chief Surgeon, Europe.

DOD Names New Deputy Assistant Secretary for Special Manpower Programs

The Department of Defense has created a new Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense position responsible for several activities of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower and Reserve Affairs)—Utilization and Management Techniques, Individual Training, Information for the Armed Forces, Project 100,000 and Project Transition.

Appointed as Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Special Manpower Programs) was David C. Stewart who has served as Special Assistant to the ASD (Manpower and Reserve Affairs) since July of last year.

Prior to his DOD appointment last year, Mr. Stewart was chief executive officer of a major advertising agency and previously a director of several oil companies.

During World War II, as a Lieutenant Commander, he was assigned to the Management Engineer's office in the Office of the Under Secretary of the Navy and was also a Management Engineer in the Electronics Division, Bureau of Ships.

Gen. Berg Testifies on Proposed Legislation To Amend 1950 Dependents Assistance Act

A proposed bill (H.R. 6729) to amend the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950 would eliminate a "basic inequity" faced by some Reservists on active duty training, according to Maj. Gen. William W. Berg, USAF, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Military Personnel Policy).

The bill would make members of the Reserve and National Guard eligible for quarters allowance and allotments if they are ordered to active duty for training for more than 30 days. Currently, the Dependents Assistance Act excludes from eligibility enlisted members on active duty for training under any enlistment program that requires an initial period of active duty training.

It would also amend sections of the act so that the general requirements of an allotment for dependents as a pre-condition for payment under the act would not apply for the period of time that a member serves on active duty for training.

Under existing law, Gen. Berg said, an enlisted man with dependents is authorized the BAQ only for the periods he had in effect an allotment for not less than his BAQ plus $40 for the support of his dependents.

With active duty training generally lasting four to six months, Gen. Berg said, "The establishment of an allotment as a pre-condition for payment of the BAQ to these personnel is not considered to be warranted."

Maj. Gen. William W. Berg

Gen. Berg, making his statements before a Senate Armed Services subcommittee, said the issue was primarily one of "justice and inequity."

"The Congress and the Department of Defense continue to receive numerous complaints from reserve servicemen and their dependents concerning the financial hardships endured by them when ordered to active duty for training," the general said.

He added that the situation is aggravated by the fact that an active duty enlistee and a reserve enlistee with no prior service may take the same basic and technical training, but receive different amounts of compensation.

"This is viewed by the reservist and his family as an unwarranted discrimination," he said.

Recognizing that the reserve enlistment program for non-prior service personnel would continue to be popular notwithstanding the entitlement, Gen. Berg said that reserves affiliating themselves with the program with the full knowledge of the stipulation in the law, do not make the "inequity or treatment in the matter of pay any more defensible."

In the past, he said, the Defense Department has provided some relief through administrative action.

"It did not, however, correct the basic inequity which denies this basic allowance for quarters to a group of individuals solely on the type of their commitment to military service," Gen. Berg said.

Multi-Nation UNITAS IX Naval Exercise Begins

A huge naval exercise involving ships and planes from eight nations, the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans as well as the Caribbean Sea is now underway.

The operation, called Unitas IX, began July 15 at San Juan, P.R., and will continue for three and one-half months.

Under the command of Rear Adm. Frederick J. Harlfinger II, USN, Commander South Atlantic Force, U.S. Atlantic Fleet, the exercise is designed to promote esprit de corps and familiarization with operational procedures of the navies involved.

During the exercise U. S. Navy forces will circumnavigate South America in a clockwise manner, transiting the Strait of Magellan and the Panama Canal.

The U.S. Navy anticipates that at various times, units of the navies and air forces of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Uruguay and Venezuela will join the U.S. task group to conduct operations.

For the first time in the nine-year history of Unitas Operations, ships and aircraft from Brazil and Colombia will join the U.S. Navy units in San Juan.

Admiral Harlfinger will be embarked in the USS Josephus Daniels, a guided missile frigate. Other Navy units include the destroyer USS Damato, the destroyer escort USS McCloy, the submarine USS Chopper, two maritime patrol aircraft, one transport aircraft, and one drone detachment from Fleet Composite Sq. Six, NAS, Norfolk, Va.

An added attraction to the Unitas IX exercise will be the Unitas/U.S. Navy Show Band from Little Creek, Va. Although the Unitas Task Force operates at sea, the Show Band is expected to crisscross the continent. Last year, during Unitas VIII, this 25 piece band, composed entirely of U.S. sailors, visited 98 cities in 14 South American countries and performed more than 200 times in 118 days before an estimated audience of 850,000.

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.
Price 5 cents (single copy). Subscription Price: $2.50 per year; $3.25 additional for foreign mailing.

☆ U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1968-342-465 / A-3